

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Introduction	<p>Ryedale District Council (RDC) - Page 6- new paragraph 1.3 – It is noted by the District Council the planning context in which this neighbourhood plan will operate. A decision is yet to be made as to whether there will be a formal review of the Ryedale Plan is continued or is subsuming into the new local plan for North Yorkshire Council. That being said, the strategic development will need to have regard to the Neighbourhood Plan with regard to any local/site specific considerations.</p> <p>RDC - Page 8- new paragraphs 1.19 and 1.20. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges that when a Neighbourhood Plan is ‘made’ it forms part of the Development Plan, but it does not become the ‘starting point’ for the deciding of planning applications. Both the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan are read concurrently, on the basis that the neighbourhood plan, in order to meet the ‘basic conditions’ requirements of being in accordance with the strategic policies of the Development Plan.</p> <p>Fitzwilliam Malton Estate (FME) - FME are one of the main landowners in Malton and are therefore uniquely placed to assist and support the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Firstly, (1) FME wish to place on record that they are supportive of the general vision and objectives of the plan, taken as a whole, notwithstanding the comments that follow. (2) It is however considered that the plan could go further in acknowledging and developing policies to support the vibrancy of the town, which has a high proportion of independent owner managed businesses, and its many facilities.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – once adopted neighbourhood plan policies will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications rather than the ‘starting point’</p> <p>(1) NOTED</p> <p>(2) NOTED – the number and variety of independent shops and restaurants is acknowledged as unique strength to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - amend para 1.20 by removing ‘will become the starting point for deciding on planning applications’ and replace with ‘Both the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan are read concurrently and the neighbourhood plan policies will form a material consideration in the determination of planning policies’</p> <p>(1) NO ACTION</p> <p>(2) ACTION – include text to describe the vibrancy of the town and the high proportion</p>

		Malton town centre's offer and it is agreed that plan text could reflect this. Re policies however, it is considered that the Local Plan Strategy already includes a comprehensive policy (SP7) which NP could not strengthen and must not duplicate. Plus the NP already includes policies on key facilities such as the swimming pool, sports centre, medical centre and museums.	of independently managed shops and restaurants.
Malton & Norton – Yesterday & Today	<p>FME - welcome the changes made to section of the neighbourhood plan to include reference to the setting up of the Malton Amenity Community Interest Company (CIC) to provide free limited-time parking in the town centre, organise events such as food festivals and promote the town more widely.</p> <p>W Clifford Watts (WCW) - We wish to preface our remarks with observations about the history of the quarrying industry in Malton and Norton. Whitewall Quarry has been in existence since at least the middle of the 19th century and very possibly for much longer before that. This would make it one of the longest lived industries in the plan area being 150-200 years old. Since the NP makes comments about the history of the towns and their heritage, we thought it appropriate to ask if mention could be made of the long history of quarrying in the area and its contribution to the local economy and to the viability of the towns. This is not to take away from the fact that specific responsibility for minerals planning lies in a dedicated Minerals and Waste Local Plan</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – it is acknowledged quarrying has been an important local industry</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – refer to history of quarrying in text</p>
Vision	FME - generally support the proposed vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan but would suggest that the importance of agriculture as an industry to Malton and Norton should be recognised alongside local food and horse racing.	NOTED – the importance of food production and the horse racing industry to the area is stated in Key Employment Sectors (4.9.7) and section 4.6 of the plan provides	NO ACTION

	<p>WCW - We also support the objective “To build upon the economic strengths of the towns and address deficiencies in the economy”. We therefore suggest a minor amendment to the vision statement as follows (deletions in strikethrough; additions in bold)</p> <p>The local food and horse-racing and other important local industries which are so much a part of the towns and their hinterland will be confirmed in their status and have developed further within a climate of promotion and encouragement.</p> <p>The over emphasis on food and horse racing industries could be at the expense of the Town seeming over protective and even dismissive of other sectors which could drive growth in the coming years – change isn’t always bad. Given that the plan is focussed on planning and development the wording of the statement gives an isolationist and anti-development [read anti new residents] feeling with no recognition of how the prospect of new residents to the area might actually enhance and invigorate the society we all live in. [and bring some well needed diversity].</p> <p>Not sure if the proposed policy amendments affect the proposed new junction between A64 and Braygate Road, which I support</p> <p>It lacks ambition for the town to grow and move forward as a thriving community. There seems to be an emphasis on ‘preventing development’</p>	<p>policies relating to the horse racing industry</p> <p>DISAGREE – the importance of quarrying to the local economy is acknowledged however the purpose of highlighting food and horse racing industries in the vision is to emphasise that these have been promoted and encouraged. It is not the role of the neighbourhood plan to address planning for quarrying which falls to the Waste and Minerals Plan</p> <p>NOTED – the vision talks about ‘appropriate housing and employment growth and opportunity, within the context of an even higher quality environment, consistent with their status as Ryedale’s principal towns’. This is not anti-development, but is realistic in the context of the constraints imposed by infrastructure capacity</p> <p>NOTED – this is dealt with in the Transportation section, the previously proposed A64/Braygate junction has been removed</p> <p>DISAGREE – the plan envisages growth in local food, horse racing industries, tourism and appropriate levels of housing and employment,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>I can see no reference to a Vision Statement. Is that deliberate?</p> <p>I am a qualified architect with 25 years experience of planning submissions and report documents. However, I find this consultation documentation very difficult to follow. There are proposed policy amendments and unchanged policies that have the same reference and are dealt with in vague or oblique language. There are so many versions of 'The Plan' and keeping track of the referencing is too difficult. I really don't believe that an average member of the public can meaningfully follow this, let alone comment meaningfully.</p>	<p>but is realistic in the context of the constraints imposed by infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>NOTED – the Vision Statement is on Page 12 of the plan</p> <p>NOTED – the Council's web page makes clear the current version of the Plan and also lists the previous versions along with all of the evidence upon which the plan is based. It is acknowledged there is a weight of information and that it can be difficult to navigate. Council Officers and Members have made themselves available to help consultees who are having difficulties. The volume and form of the documents are however prescribed by the relevant statutory processes and are outside the control of the councils.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Objectives	<p>We generally support the objectives set out in the Plan subject to more detailed comments below.</p> <p>In general agreement other than my two later comments.</p> <p>I disagree with one policy amendment, no 5 (or 25?)</p> <p>Think they say everything needed</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – we assumed bullet 5, but no explanation provided as to why the consultee disagrees</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>They are a bit parochial and don't seem very forward looking or accepting of change.</p> <p>I'd like safer routes to school</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree with all of them</p> <p>Focused and apposite.</p> <p>agree all</p> <p>Designating the green space to the west of Malton IF it means not providing the proposed new junction between Braygate and A64.</p> <p>The initial submission was sufficient. This subsequent submission has been made for the benefit of certain MTC Councillors.</p> <p>In agreement</p>	<p>NOTED – the objectives reflect the challenges and future opportunities identified through the plan formulation process, these are inevitably local in nature</p> <p>AGREE – the plan contains policies for footpaths and cycleway provision in Section 4, but it is accepted specific mention could be made of safer routes to schools</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – but it is not considered appropriate to include this as an objective of the plan as these are of a more strategic nature</p> <p>DISAGREE – this comment does not relate to the objectives. The reasons for the changes being sought by both Malton and Norton Town Councils are clearly set out in the summary document, these are intended to be for the benefit of the whole community</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action to address safer routes to school issue.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>The objectives are largely sound, but (1) a specific objective around improving the pedestrian experience around the town would have been helpful, incorporating safer crossings, better footpaths, a pedestrian/cycle river bridge, pavement quality, etc. Malton and Norton are difficult and frequently unpleasant places to walk around as so much priority is given to traffic. As for cycling in Malton and Norton, that is a non starter on safety grounds. (2) I do not agree with housing for local needs' only. The town needs to grow and be welcoming to incomers. I disagree with the insular drawbridge approach. Recent large scale housing developments have brought in a range of people who contribute so much to the town. (3) The railway station facilities and capacity are poor. Does the plan show sufficient ambition for enhancements in this respect?</p> <p>They are ok</p> <p>HORSE RACING INDUSTRY - horse racing museum. Existing Malton Museum and Woodhams Stone need greater support. How can another museum be viable? HOUSING. The towns' infrastructure and health/education provision must come first. MALTON SPECIFIC POLICIES. Car parking spaces in Malton Market Place are to the detriment of pedestrians and 'cafe culture' eg immediately outside the New Malton / Chapter Two. We need a market place for people, not cars. HOUSING. Infrastructure needs to be in place before any new houses are built. Empty properties should be developed first.</p> <p>I very much support improvements and connection to the A64 from Broughton Road. This is essential to avoid traffic congestion, noise, pollution, and improve safety by redirecting traffic from the centre of Malton.</p> <p>ok</p>	<p>(1) AGREE – Section 4.1 of the plan addresses the issues and provides policies to support walking and cycling</p> <p>(2) NOTED - Section 4.8 of the plan describes the rationale for the housing policy and the rationale for this objective. Ultimately it will be the upper tier (RDC/NYC) authority's role to identify housing requirements and site allocations.</p> <p>(3) NOTED – however, this point has not been highlighted as an issue consultees feel strongly about</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – these points do not relate to the plan's Objectives, but have been addressed under the relevant policies later in this document</p> <p>NOTED – this point does not relate to the plan's Objectives and has been addressed under the relevant policies later in this document</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>(1) NO ACTION</p> <p>(2) NO ACTION</p> <p>(3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

4.1 Transport & Movement - General	RDC - Page 14- insertion of new paragraph. The District Council acknowledges the need to support the delivery of active travel, the inserted paragraph acknowledges the practical issues of this but does not offer solutions or sites which would be seen to be capable and deliverable in addressing such an issue, and the Neighbourhood Plan is an ideal vehicle to identify such sites (subject to their delivery).	NOTED – the narrative highlights the lack of cycle parking and storage in Malton and in particular Market Place and policy TM1 provides a general requirement to provide safe, secure and covered cycle parking. Other location specific requirements for cycle parking are not known so it is not possible to offer site specific solutions at this stage.	NO ACTION
Policy TM1	<p>RDC - Page 15- Policy TM1- (TM1-8) concerning the removal of footpath within the grounds of Malton School. This raised safeguarding issues during the consultation on the previous plan, and its removal is justified.</p> <p>RDC - Page 15- TM1 Policy TM1 Replace with “Providing an appropriate amount of safe, secure and covered cycle parking to promote cycling, particularly as part of all new development which includes provision of parking spaces”. Is this in relation to non-housing developments, and it is necessary to specifically refer to sites with provision of parking spaces?</p> <p>RDC - Pages 16 and 17-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional paragraph 4.1.13 concerning “potentially linking to a southern bypass connecting York Road, Welham Road, Beverley Road and Scarborough Road, although this has yet to be examined through a technical feasibility study”. • Para 4.1.14 Amend to “As such, Neighbourhood Plan policy aims to encourage traffic that does not need to 3 bypass. In order to do this, the plan aspires to selected A64 junction improvements, in order to increase junction capacity at Broughton Road, by creating four-way junctions instead of two way slip roads and creating a new junction with the A64 at Castle Howard Road/Braygate Street.” pass through the towns, out onto the A64 bypass. In order to do this, the plan aspires to selected A64 junction improvements, by creating a new 	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the intention is to promote cycling and to promote cycle parking/storage etc in all forms of new development.</p> <p>AGREE – (1) para 4.1.9 already references the evidences the transport evidence base, supporting the local plan, but the point about proposals to support planned growth to 2027 being in place can be emphasised.</p> <p>(2) The 2nd pre-submission draft removes previous policies which were not supported by evidence, specifically these were the previously</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1) ACTION – add to end of para 4.1.9, ‘The adopted development plan and the evidence base supporting the plan is clear on the strategic transport improvements that are necessary to support planned growth to 2027.’</p> <p>(2) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>junction with the A64 at Broughton Road (B1257) and exploring the potential for other improvements including a 4 way junction at Musley Bank.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy TM3, delete “A64/Braygate Street Junction” and delete “TM3-4 Southern Bypass Castle Howard Road – Beverley Road” • insert text “The potential provision of a Southern Bypass, connecting York Road with Welham Road, Beverley Road and Scarborough Road, in order to further relieve congestion, is also supported, subject to further technical assessment.” <p>The District Council made comments on the previous plan iteration about the references to strategic infrastructure proposals which are not formally planned for. “Traffic and transport matters have a high profile in the document and the District Council understands the desire for road infrastructure improvements that will help to alleviate traffic congestion in the central road network. (1) Whilst some of the improvements referred to will help to alleviate road congestion, they are not required to support planned growth at the towns to 2027. The adopted development plan and the evidence base supporting the plan is clear on the strategic transport improvements that are necessary to support planned growth. To avoid any confusion or ambiguity, this should be made clearer in the supporting text. (2) Furthermore, a number of the improvements referred to have not previously been evidenced as being highway improvements which would reduce congestion. An A64/Castle Howard road junction and a Castle Howard Road- Broughton Road link road are examples. Without evidence that these further improvements would result in network improvements these should not be referred to in the plan, even in an aspirational sense.” It is noted that instead of being identified as a policy consideration, the provision of a southern bypass is now a policy aspiration is supported subject to technical assessment. The comments made previously are therefore still relevant.</p> <p>RDC - It is noted that instead of being identified as a policy consideration, the provision of a southern bypass is now a policy aspiration is supported subject to technical assessment. The comments made previously are therefore still relevant.</p>	<p>proposed A64/Castle Howard road junction The Castle Howard Road-Broughton Road link road was removed from the previous submission version, so this comment is not relevant.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION - make it clear in text that technical assessment includes assessment of</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>WCW - We support the intention of this policy to improve access for cyclists, particularly on Welham Rd because any action to reduce conflict between different road users is to be welcomed.</p> <p>I do not agree with. We need safer crossing along Highfield Road at certain points. Zebra crossing at junction of Rainbow Lane onto Highfield Road. 20mph all along Highfield Road as the limit for 20 is very short.</p> <p>I object to the reference to only 7 No specific routes in relation to future development proposals. It seems other significant routes have been omitted where improvements to non-motorised modes of travel are equally relevant; either remove the reference to the specific 7 No routes and engender a 'general' approach across the Neighbourhood Plan area (not limiting options) or add the following roads – Old Malton Road, Castle Howard Road, York Road and Middlecave Road.</p> <p>I'd like zebra crossings on Pasture Lane by the cemetery gate, Showfield Lane and Rainbow Lane</p> <p>approve amendments</p> <p>Any initiatives which make it easier and safer to walk and cycle must be prioritised.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – It is not clear which part of the policy is not agreed with, however the point about safer crossings is a recurring theme in the Reg 14 consultation and should be referenced in the plan</p> <p>NOTED – The wording of the policy is that improvements to the network will be encouraged/ supported 'including' the 7 routes which have been identified. However it is accepted that this is not a comprehensive list and that there will be others, but the policy as worded allows for this.</p> <p>NOTED – safer crossings have featured consistently in feedback. The precise locations and form of crossing will need to be agreed with NYC, but the principle is supported.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – encouraging more walking and cycling is a strong theme with the plan discussed in para 4.1.4 and elsewhere. There has been feedback</p>	<p>network improvements that would result</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - Add new community action in respect of the location highlighted</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - Add new community action in respect of the 3 locations highlighted</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - Add new community actions in respect of the 3 crossing locations highlighted</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>more development to make pedestrians and cyclists safer the better (comment made under TM 2)</p> <p>We must encourage walking and cycling (comment made under TM 2)</p> <p>New cycle racks of sufficient height to lock the bike frame to are required to comply with insurance requirements.</p> <p>A considerable of money has been spent on the cycleway from Malton to Pickering. However at the Malton end there is a section through the woods and after the woods leading to the tarmac section to Windmill Farm which is in a very poor state with large potholes and thick mud making it impossible to ride. Please would the Council address this issue.</p>	<p>on a need for safer crossings and routes to school which the NP will seek to address</p> <p>AGREE - encouraging more walking and cycling is a strong theme with the plan discussed in para 4.1.4 and elsewhere. There has been feedback on a need for safer crossings and routes to school which the NP will seek to address</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM1 promotes safe, secure and covered cycle parking which is considered sufficient for the purposes of the plan.</p> <p>NOTED – however this is outside the plan boundary - it is possible the Town Council can take up this issue direct with those responsible</p>	<p>in other comments and re safer routes to school</p> <p>ACTION - Add new community actions in respect of the 3 crossing locations highlighted in other comments and re safer routes to school</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – refer the matter to the Town Council to raise with responsible agency, but no changes to the plan.</p>
Policy TM2	the text in the plan is difficult to fathom. I would support a new pedestrian /cycle crossing	NOTED – it is not clear which text is difficult to understand	NO ACTION
Policy TM3	<p>WCW - We also support the provision of a new southern bypass (TM3-4). However, we would like to see changes to parts of this policy where it relates to developer contributions. We suggest the following text:</p> <p>Developers will be expected to make reasonable on-site provision and/or off-site provision of transport infrastructure, where it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to support new development will result in significant additional traffic and/or to rectify existing</p>	AGREE – amend policy wording as suggested while also clarifying reach of final paragraph	ACTION - amend policy wording as suggested, but also make clear that this final paragraph relates to all development by inserting 'In all development,' at start of paragraph, and not just to Southern By-pass as wording of comment suggests

	<p>evidenced deficiencies in such infrastructure (for example, in relation to highway safety or traffic calming measures).</p> <p>Assuming it still promotes the Braygate - A64 junction (comment made under TM1)</p> <p>Broughton Road to A64 connection is vital (comment made under TM1)</p> <p>It is vital that a proposed route for the southern by-pass is reflected in the Plan. Allowing building to be carried out in a potential By-Pass corridor will be totally stupid. Please include a positive line for the By-Pass.</p> <p>(1)The removal of the A64/Braygate Street junction compromises the feasibility of the current 2nd pre-submission document as compared to the original submission in so far as the southern bypass can no longer connect to Castle Howard Road previously shown as TM4-4. For the record I did not support the A64/Braygate Street junction as the beginning/end of the southern bypass simply due to the nature of the adjoining local roads. I do object to the removal of the remaining length of the potential southern bypass between Beverley Road, Welham Road and York Road: The document says that the route is</p>	<p>AGREE – policy TM3-1 includes A64/B1257 Broughton Road Junction Improvements</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is not possible to show a route for a southern by pass as feasibility work and a technical assessment and has not been undertaken. To show a route without an evidence base to support it would risk blighting the affected area. It is considered that the proposal is presented in a positive light as policy TM3 states ‘The potential provision of a Southern Bypass, connecting York Road with Welham Road, Beverley Road and Scarborough Road, in order to further relieve congestion, is also supported, subject to further technical assessment.’</p> <p>(1)DISAGREE – The previously proposed A64/Braygate Street junction has been removed as there is no technical evidence provided to support this proposal in terms of design, cost, land take or its impact on the AONB. It is not evidenced as a realistic or deliverable proposal. It is not necessary for a southern bypass</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>supported but subject to a further technical assessment – this is not reason enough to remove the indicative route from the plan. In Para1.5 on Page 6 the plan itself says “The Plans do not need to be comprehensive but can concentrate on issues that are seen to be locally important” – why not then retain the indicative route of the southern bypass between Beverley Road and York Road? This would also link up with TM5-1 that sits in isolation on the plan.</p> <p>(2)Furthermore, the removal of the A64/BraygateStreet junction puts more emphasis on the Musley bank interchange that sits outside the Neighbourhood Plan area and policies i.e. outside the influence of the plan. A full 4-way interchange is sorely needed at Musley Bank to take account of growth of the York Road Industrial Park and also as a means of limited through traffic in Malton.</p> <p>I agree with the removal of the proposal for a junction at Braygate Road/Castle Howard Road: This road is not needed. Building it would destroy valuable local footpaths that many people use daily. I 'don't know' about the southern bypass.</p> <p>Strongly agree with amendments</p> <p>(1)A64 to York Road should be improved for addition of all direction access. (2)Consideration of access to A64 bypass York direction side, directly from the far end of Showfield Lane.</p>	<p>to connect to Castle Howard Road which is a local/rural access road, a southern bypass can connect York Road with Welham Road, Beverley Road and Scarborough Road, but this is subject to a technical assessment</p> <p>(2)AGREE – a 4 way junction at Musley Bank is widely seen as a necessary strategic transport improvement. It is acknowledged this is outside the town boundaries, but this is not a reason in itself to promote an alternative transport scheme. Instead local stakeholders should be lobbying the relevant agencies/authorities to invest in these improvements</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>(1)NOTED – it is assumed this comment related to the potential for a 4 way junction at the intersection of the A64 and York Road which is widely seen as a necessary strategic transport improvement, albeit outside the plan boundary. An action will be included in the Community Action section to lobby for this.</p>	<p>ACTION – add an action under the Community Action section to lobby for improvements to the Musley Bank road junction</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1)ACTION - add an action under the Community Action section to lobby for improvements to the Musley Bank road junction</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>There is little chance that Highways England will build a grade separated junction on the A64 where the B1257 crosses it. The best solution to reduce town centre congestion is to have a link road to the west of the town linking the B1257 to Castle Howard Road and York Road. The current idea of routing HGVs through the Peasy Hills estate and past two primary schools is dangerous and irresponsible.</p> <p>A new road junction with the A64 would alleviate traffic issues at the junction of Castle Howard Road and Yorkersgate</p> <p>Thank you for consulting with local businesses in relation to the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Development Plan ('Plan').</p>	<p>(2) this has not previously been assessed through a transport assessment but is an option that could be explored next time the NYC transport assessment is updated. There is no evidence to draw upon for it to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The previously proposed A64/Braygate Street junction and link to the B1257 has been removed as there is no technical evidence provided to support this proposal in terms of design, cost, land take or its impact on the AONB. It is not evidenced as a realistic or deliverable proposal. On the other hand a junction for the A64 and B1257 has been tested in the 2010 Transport Assessment. The comments on the likelihood of Highways England approval are however noted</p> <p>DISAGREE - The previously proposed A64/Braygate Street junction and link to the B1257 has been removed as there is no technical evidence provided to support this proposal in terms of design, cost, land take or its impact on the AONB. It is not evidenced as a realistic or deliverable proposal.</p> <p>(1) NOTED – this is a matter for the local planning authority to consider</p>	<p>(2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Karro Food Limited ('Karro') is a major local employer located (and headquartered) at Norton Grove Industrial Estate, and one of the UK's leading pork processors.</p> <p>Karro is aware of the link road scheme referred to at TM3-3 in the draft Plan, and the Ryedale Local Plan allocation for residential development on land adjacent to the Karro site (presently subject to a planning application). (1)As part of this consultation we wanted to ensure you were aware that we have made formal representations objecting to this planning application. The application presently before Ryedale District Council will impact adversely on the operation of our business. We want to ensure that proper allowance and measures are incorporated in the application so that Karro can continue to operate and thrive.</p> <p>Karro is inextricably connected to local agriculture and the area's rich agricultural heritage. Local farmers felt so passionate about marketing high quality pork they had to petition Parliament in the 1930's so that the Karro site could be built, and the site has been integral to the area's ongoing prosperity over the last 90 years.</p> <p>We agree with the statements in the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan that food production has always played an important part in the surrounding area, and that local employment sectors need to be encouraged. (2)However, the statement (at 4.9.2) that the "majority of jobs are provided by small local firms employing less than 25 staff" does not acknowledge the contribution of industrial employers. Surely this statement cannot be correct given that the Norton Town Council website itself states that Karro is the "town's largest employer" and "provides over 2000 jobs" – something that we feel needs to be reflected in the Plan.</p> <p>I very much support improvements and connection to the A64 from Broughton Road. This is essential to avoid traffic congestion, noise, pollution, and improve safety by redirecting traffic from the centre of Malton.</p>	<p>in assessing the planning application, however in broad terms, as is highlighted, the neighbourhood plan is supportive of employment in the food sector</p> <p>(2)NOTED – the employment data is correct. However, the point made about the importance of some major employees is also correct and this can be noted in the plan</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>(2)ACTION – amend text in 4.9.2 to acknowledge the importance of major employees to the area and its economy</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>Policy TM4</p>	<p>I am generally supportive of this policy but would recommend that the list of highway management improvements should also refer to a dedicated pedestrian/cycle bridge not necessarily close to County Bridge [potentially associated with TM2-1 or elsewhere].</p> <p>Consideration of a pedestrian bridge from rear area of Lidl to the Railway Station would give a(safer) alternative crossing point.</p> <p>This crossing is unsafe for pedestrians.</p> <p>Particularly TM4-1</p>	<p>AGREE – this point has been raised by a number of consultees and can be included within the policy TM4</p> <p>AGREE – this point has been raised by a number of consultees and can be included within the policy TM4</p> <p>NOTED – the issues around the crossing and the junction have been highlighted in the text and policies in TM2 and TM4 are aimed to address this point</p> <p>NOTED – it is not clear what this comment relates to as there is no policy TM4 -1, but it appears to be a point of emphasis</p>	<p>ACTION – add a further bullet to TM4 re pedestrian/cycle bridge</p> <p>ACTION – add a further bullet to TM4 re pedestrian/cycle bridge</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy TM5</p>	<p>FME - own land to the south of York Road and where the suggested route of the new road crossing is shown (TM5-1). This land is being promoted (site ref: 137) as an extension to the adjacent industrial estate for employment uses as part of the Ryedale Local Plan Review. FME have no issue in principle with the proposed crossing and would be happy to ensure that the delivery of any future link is not prejudiced by the development of their land to the south of York Road. Indeed, the development of the land for employment related uses would enable the delivery of appropriate road infrastructure to the edge of the site as part of any development.</p> <p>FME - In terms of the TM5-2, FME also own land which would be affected by the proposed designation at Barks Knott Terrace. This land is being promoted for residential development as part of the Ryedale Local Plan Review (site 139). FME have no issue in principle with the</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>proposed crossing and would be happy to ensure that the delivery of any future link is not prejudiced by the development of their land. As with the land off York Road, the development of the land for residential development would enable the delivery of appropriate road infrastructure to the edge of the site as part of any development.</p> <p>Generally supportive of the policy but not sure that the policy should refer to specific sites rather than simply being generic. (1)I object to the inclusion of proposal TM5-2 as the pressure on Church Street/Welham Road/level crossing will remain and it will also increase pressure on the Railway Street/ Yorkersgate junction with the effects not clearly understood. Surely encouraging multi-modal transport rather than pandering to motorists is the answer – (2)a fway/cycleway bridge crossing the railway at the same/similar point as the bridge proposed inTM5-2?</p> <p>Definitely see comment to TM4</p>	<p>(1)DISAGREE – the two potential crossing points are those that have been identified through the plan formulation process so it is considered to be appropriate to reference these. More generally the plan through section 4 gives substantial weight to encouraging supporting cycling and walking.</p> <p>(2)AGREE – a number of consultees have raised this and it is proposed to add a potential footway/cycleway bridge to policy TM4</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>(1)NO ACTION</p> <p>(2)ACTION – add a further bullet to TM4 re pedestrian/cycle bridge</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy TM6	<p>FME - object to the wording of draft policy TM6 as it does not have appropriate regard to national policy and therefore does not meet the basic conditions. In particular, (1) it proposes a significantly more onerous test when considering the highways impacts of a development proposal. It requires proposals to demonstrate that they do not exceed the cumulative capacity of transport infrastructure. The test set out in national planning policy is at paragraph 111 of NPPF and states:</p> <p>“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”.</p> <p>Clearly the proposed test set out in draft policy TM6 is not in line with national policy and therefore does not meet the basic conditions.</p>	<p>(1) NOTED</p>	<p>(1) ACTION Amend wording of policy TM6 by replacing ‘demonstrates that it does not exceed the cumulative capacity of transport infrastructure’ With; ‘demonstrates that it does not cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe’</p>

	<p>(2) Whilst FME fully acknowledge the issues around air quality in Malton and the need to ensure that developments mitigate their impacts, the wording of the proposed test in draft policy TM6 is not in line with national policy which at paragraph 174e) suggests that policies should prevent unacceptable levels of air pollution. It does not say that development should be prevented which may worsen air quality.</p> <p>I agree in principle to the policy but fail to see how any significant development can meet the requirement to NOT result in any measurable worsening of air quality in or around the Malton AQMA: This statement is vague as it doesn't quantify 'measurable worsening' and it could easily be used to prevent any development in the area. I object to this statement and suggest it be removed unless it is quantified/defined better.</p> <p>Baffling</p>	<p>2) DISAGREE – there is already an unacceptable level of poor air quality in Malton.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there are well established methods of measuring air quality and these are applied to the monitoring undertaken within the AQMA. The risks to human health are considered to be so significant that this should be an overriding issue and its inclusion should encourage mitigation measures.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is not clear from the comment what is baffling</p>	<p>(2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
TM7	<p>can't find it</p> <p>It seems obvious to me that the Malton AQMA is affected more by traffic generated outside the AQMA than within so why does the Plan state that proposals for new development in or adjacent to the AQMA will be 'encouraged' to provide charging infrastructure in excess on the minimum standard? I can understand the use of the term 'supported' but encouraged implies pressure will be brought to bear which could in-turn actually discourage potential [and worthy]development in this area. When it comes to the AQMA the aim should be to reduce through traffic, that results in long traffic queues and stationary/slow moving vehicles, by placing more emphasis on links to the A64.</p>	<p>NOTED – Policy TM7 is on page 20 of the plan.</p> <p>NOTED – it is both through traffic and new traffic generated by development which affect air quality. The provision for enhanced levels of electric vehicle charging in or adjacent to the AQMA is intended to deal with part of the causes. Other measures in Section 4 promote strategic road improvements to alleviated through traffic.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Can't find it in the plan	NOTED - Policy TM7 is on page 20 of the plan	NO ACTION
TM8	<p>We suggest this policy duplicates national Planning Policy (NPPF para 113 & Ryedale Policy SP20). It should be deleted.</p> <p>Can't find it</p> <p>That's common sense</p>	<p>DISAGREE – both NPPF para 113 and Ryedale Local Plan Strategy Policy SP20 refer to 'Travel Plans' as distinct from 'Traffic Management Plans' within the context of a Construction Management Plan. As such there is no duplication. RDC have at no point indicated there is any duplication. NB Stephen – duplication is to be avoided just as much as conflict</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM8 is on page 20 of the plan</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy RC1	<p>FME - ME raised concerns as part of the consultation on the previous submission draft of the plan on the legibility of the proposals map. Following further discussions with Norton Town Council, it was confirmed that the area to which this policy relates is highlighted in brown and also by brown hatching on the proposals map. It however still remains difficult to establish from the draft proposals map the boundaries of this designation against physical features on the ground. It is unclear whether the area includes land which is in FME's ownership (outside the existing picnic area) as shown on the plan at Appendix B. If there is any encroachment into this area the proposal map should be amended to ensure that it excludes any land in FME's ownership shown on the plan as this area is previously developed former industrial land which is inappropriate for inclusion in the designation.</p> <p>This Policy should be strengthened by adding reference to opportunities to provide interpretation panels explaining the historic</p>	<p>NOTED – important that any boundary disputes are resolved.</p> <p>AGREED – this suggestion provides an important link with the tourism</p>	<p>ACTION – boundary to be checked/amended as necessary/agreed with FME</p> <p>ACTION – add following wording to policy RC1:</p>

	<p>significance of the River in terms of the historic and Roman settlement of Malton and its significance for the commercial development of both Malton and Norton and linked to a wider visitor trail of interpretation panels ;</p> <p>Yes please - definitely agree and want this to happen.</p>	<p>proposals 'interpretation panels explaining the historic significance of the River in terms of the historic and Roman settlement of Malton and its significance for the commercial development of both Malton and Norton and linked to a wider visitor trail of interpretation panels'</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>'provide river history interpretation panels'. Add new community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy RC2	<p>FME support the regeneration of land north and south of county bridge and welcome the extension of the proposed designation to include land to the east (south of Sheepfoot Hill) which is also predominantly in the ownership of the Estate. However, FME remain concerned that draft policy RC2 seems to restrict potential residential uses in this location. The draft policy states:</p> <p>"No residential or other vulnerable use (in terms of flood risk) coming forward on this land and subject to development meeting the sequential test and where applicable the exceptions test in line with national policy".</p> <p>It is noted that the majority of the area is located within Flood Zone 3 but with the benefit of flood defences as are large parts of the centre of Malton, it is considered that the policy should not rule out residential development entirely given the sustainable brownfield nature of the site where the sequential and exceptions tests could be readily passed. The way the policy is currently worded is therefore not consistent with NPPF and does not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>The policy is supported subject to development contributing to the provision of interpretation panels</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this policy clause and its wording flows directly from the Habitat Regulations Assessment and cannot be amended. Amendment will result in a revised HRA which will rule that adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC cannot be ruled out. As such, the amended policy/plan could not progress</p> <p>NOTED – developer contributions policy will be set by NYC, Policy RC1 will be amended to support/encourage interpretation panels, this can be a basis to lobby NYC</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Supportive of this policy but object to the inclusion of the condition to retain the on-site public conveniences. This will hinder any potential development of what is a poor quality area when we should rather be encouraging it.</p> <p>These areas are eyesores.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the policy includes ‘replacement’ as well as ‘retention’. Feedback has been to support the provision of public WC’s and provision should not hinder redevelopment of what is a substantial land area</p> <p>AGREE – this is the reason the policy has been included</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E1	<p>(1) RDC - Page 25- Policy E1 add ‘High Malton’ to a list of Local Green Spaces E1-9. The justification of this commences on Page 72 and continues onto 73:</p> <p>Local Green Space is defined in National Planning Policy within the section on Open Space and Recreation as: <i>101. The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. 102. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. 103. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.</i></p> <p>The District Council has significant concerns with the inclusion of the land identified as High Malton as an area of Local Green Space. The land identified as High Malton is land to the North of Castle Howard</p>	<p>(1) DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p>	<p>(1) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Road, which was the subject of planning application which named the site 'High Malton'. (1) The analysis which has been undertaken to justify the inclusion of the site does not provide a clear documented evidence that the land meets the definition of Local Green Space within National Planning Policy definition as set out above. The above table does not demonstrate that the site is capable of being designated a Local Green Space for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is acknowledged to be an 'extensive tract of land'. • The land is in private ownership with no means of public access across the site. The existing routes and pathways are either next to the site along established roads or footpath to the north and south or on the other side of the A64 and distanced from the site. The site itself is not used or accessed. • There is no identified heritage consideration. • The trees are a key feature of the setting of this part of the entrance to the town Some of the trees are protected by Tree Preservation Order. • It does contribute to the setting of the AONB. • The land itself is used for growing crops and pasture and as such has no demonstrable ecological significance which is different to that of other tree lined fields in the locality; There is a local SINC site, but it is outside of the field boundaries and is the cutting of the A64. <p>The District Council supports the delivery of the neighbourhood plan, and recognises that there are spaces of significant importance to the local community, and that a neighbourhood plan is a natural place to identify such areas of open space. But the inclusion of this land 'High Malton' as a Local Green Space, in the view of the Local Planning Authority does not meet national policy and as such would fail the basic conditions test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2)Being "demonstrably special" to the local community a crucial justification. The justification provided in the assessment specifically refers to "cherished visual amenity to bordering properties along its eastern edge, which back onto the space". This is seeking the protection of a private view, which is not a material planning 	<p>(2) AGREE</p>	<p>(2)ACTION - Remove part of the justification in the assessment of the area being 'demonstrably special' to the local community because it provides a "cherished visual</p>
--	---	------------------	---

	<p>consideration, and therefore cannot be judged as a justification for the identification of Local Green Space.</p> <p>(3) Reference is also made to the extensive responses to the planning application. These are not demonstrably reflecting the justification of the Local Green Space designation, because they have not resulted from the neighbourhood plan consultation process. Instead, they represented the strength of feeling in the locality towards a planning application which was for 500 homes. They are not, in the view of the Council, interchangeable forms of evidence.</p> <p>(4) There is open farmland of similar use and appearance around the settlements of Malton and Norton, and would bring similar amenity values to the local residents; it is (appropriately) not identified as Local Green Space. Further to this, there is land to the south of Castle Howard Road, which is publically accessible by means of a public right of way, provides allotments and is used by the local community as a recreational resource for walking as it affords sweeping views of the Wolds and south eastern Howardian Hills AONB. This is not mentioned or identified in the document at all, as a proposed Local Green Space or indeed why it was discounted. Why is this land, where it has a greater recreational value, not been considered for such a designation?</p> <p>(5) It is very much recognised by the District Council that this parcel of land has acknowledged sensitivities which were identified during the course of the planning application's consideration. It contributes to the Castle Howard Road gateway into the town and has strong landscape intervisibility due to its elevation relative to other landscapes. It contributes to the setting of the adjacent AONB,</p>	<p>amenity to bordering properties along its eastern edge, which back onto the space"</p> <p>(3) DISAGREE – this is legitimate evidence of the site being demonstrably special to the local community. The fact that it is evidence that has not been generated directly by NP consultation is irrelevant. Regulation 14 consultation provided extensive complementary evidence to this effect.</p> <p>(4) DISAGREE – there is no evidence to suggest that these areas are demonstrably special to any community within Malton or Norton.</p> <p>(5) NOTED – alongside designation of High Malton as a Local Green Space (but not as an alternative) it is accepted there are strong grounds to strengthen other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan to recognise the</p>	<p>(3) NO ACTION</p> <p>(4) NO ACTION</p> <p>(5) ACTION - consider other policy options for the NP, including VIUA (Visually Important Undeveloped Area) mechanism to strengthen recognition of the importance</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>providing a transitional landscape setting, but these are not in themselves justification to include land as Local Green Space. The District Council would seek, as an alternative approach, that the landscape sensitivity context of this land should be strengthened through other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan to recognise the importance of the land to the setting of this part of Malton, as a gateway to the town, and the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>RDC - The footnote1 is also not correctly attributed to the relevant consideration (proximity to the AONB).</p> <p>RDC - The District Council welcome the reference to the provision of green infrastructure, but notes that this will be challenging in some parts of the built up areas to deliver. But from November 2023 it will be mandatory to demonstrate quantifiable net gain in biodiversity, and green Infrastructure will be an integral part of delivery of that requirement.</p> <p>FME - FME own the land identified as E1-3 Norton Road Riverside which is currently a picnic area and an adjacent area of previously developed land which is currently used as a skatepark. The two areas are identified on the plan at Appendix B.</p> <p>The land which is the picnic area is also identified in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy as open space under policy SP11. However, draft policy E1 introduces a very special circumstances test for the redevelopment of such sites, this is inconsistent with policy SP11 of the Ryedale Local Plan which provides a series of criteria which the redevelopment of such sites would need to meet.</p> <p>The land which is currently used as a skatepark is not identified as open space in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy as under policy SP11. FME therefore object to its proposed designation as Local Green Space under draft policy E1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The land is a previously developed former industrial site and does not function or have the attributes of local green space. It is clearly different from the</p>	<p>importance of the land to the setting of this part of Malton, as a gateway to the town, and the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>DISAGREE – footnote 1 is a reference to the Landscape significance of the High Malton Area and is considered to be correctly attributed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the land currently used as a skateboard park meets the criteria for Local Green Space. It is acknowledged that there is a potential conflict here between policies, which hinges on the interpretation of ‘general conformity’. On the one hand it could be argued that as both policies seek to protect open space, there is general conformity. On the other hand, the circumstances in which development would be permitted differ between the 2 policies. It is considered on balance that the proposed LGS designation should</p>	<p>of the land to the setting of this part of Malton, as a gateway to the town, and the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>land around it and that designated as open space through policy SP11 of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. For these reasons, the land which is currently occupied by the skatepark (see plan at Appendix B) should be excluded from the proposed local green space allocation under draft policy E1.</p> <p>FME - E1-9 High Malton, FME strongly object to the inclusion of land at High Malton as Local Green Space as it is entirely unjustified and unsupported by planning guidance and policy. Paragraph 101 of NPPF states, “the designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period” (Our Emphasis).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the assessment below against the tests at paragraph 102 of NPPF, the proposed allocation of the land at High Malton as Local Green Space is clearly inconsistent with sustainable development and investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. The western side of Malton provides the only suitable location for further housing development in the town and potential growth in this location should not be constrained by an unjustified designation for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>The designation of the area of land suggested as Local Green Space would clearly contrary to paragraph 102 of NPPF which states: “The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local <p>significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p>	<p>remain and it should be noted that RDC have not objected to the proposed designation.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	------------------

	<p>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land". Paragraph 013 (reference ID: 37-013-20140306) of PPG provides guidance on what types of green area can be identified as Local Green Space. It states:</p> <p>"The green area will need to meet the criteria set out in paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whether to designate land is a matter for local discretion. For example, green areas could include land where sports pavilions, boating lakes or structures such as war memorials are located, allotments, or urban spaces that provide a tranquil oasis"</p> <p>Whilst the guidance advises that whether to designate land is a matter for local discretion the examples it provides are clearly typologies of land (green spaces) which are accessible and usable by the public. When this is read alongside criteria C of paragraph 102 of NPPF which confirms that the green space should not be an extensive tract of land, it is clear that the policy is not intended to apply to privately owned agricultural land which offers no recreational value and is not in any event green space.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of the 2nd Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan provides the Neighbourhood Plan Groups assessment of the High Malton site against the tests set out at paragraph 102 of NPPF. The assessment is provided in Table 1 below with FME's response to each criteria in red (NB commentary on FME comments in the Table is covered in the next column).</p> <p>It is abundantly clear from the guidance in NPPF and PPG that the Local Green Space designation should not be used to allocate large tracts of land and blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, the designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name. This is precisely what the Neighbourhood Plan Group are trying to achieve with this designation and it clearly fails to meet the requirements of NPPF and therefore the basic conditions.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that draft E1 is not in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Ryedale Local Plan</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Strategy or the NPPF. Area E1 – 3 Norton Road Riverside and should be amended accordingly and E1-9 High Malton should be removed entirely for the clear reasons provided.</p> <p>WCW - We suggest that the designation of lands as Green Space if they already have a local nature conservation designation such as SINC, are incompatible. Although it is possible for recreation and nature conservation to co-exist, we suggest that in the case of Scott's Hill (E1-5) designation as a Green Space will increase pressure on the calcareous grassland for which the site is designated, and increase bare areas devoid of vegetation caused as a result of overuse for public recreation. We ask that you reconsider this site for the proposed designation on the grounds it might cause the nature conservation value to decline.</p> <p>The policy is supported subject to examine the potential to provide interpretations panels relating to the history of the area (where appropriate)</p> <p>I refer to the area known as High Malton and the land between Castle Howard Road and Middlecave Road. This area is clearly an infill location between the main town and the A64 By-Pass, and does not affect in any way the Howardian Hills ANOB. National Planning rules and guidelines would not accept the move to make the area Green Space . This particular amendment proposal indicates a form of 'Not in My Back Yard' attitude and will not work within Planning law.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – wildlife value is a key component of the assessment of LGS eligibility so not incompatible with it – Scott's Hill scores positively against this criterion. Recreation value is also an assessment criterion – here Scott's Hill also scores positively, but only on the basis of the permissive access allowed. LGS status in no way signifies or encourages any increase in recreational use/access over and above that already allowed. It seeks only to protect what is already there against any kind of future development.</p> <p>NOTED — not possible to respond in policy terms because unclear to what area comment relates. A community action could be added re considering panels on history where LGS/other sites have acknowledged historic interest.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re investigating which LGS/historic sites warrant interpretation panels, in cooperation with Malton Museum's existing initiative.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>I disagree with the inclusion of High Malton as designate local green space</p> <p>I object to the inclusion of E1-9 High Malton to the list of sites. (1)The proposal does not meet the definition 'to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities' whereas the other proposals do and most essentially to the wider community. This proposal has clearly been put forward in the self-interest of residents living in this quarter of Malton, predominantly wealthy, privileged and resistant to change (of any sort): The classic NIMBY. (2)Stating that the area is 'part of the setting for the Howardian Hills AONB' is disingenuous [at best] and raises the question what other communities close to the border of the AONB should share this status/benefit - for example, Fryton, Slingsy, Barton-le-Street, Appleton-le-Street, Amotherby, Swinton and Broughton? To go ahead with the designation is to discriminate against other areas of Malton and Norton. This land should not be given any special status for which it simply does not deserve. The [potential] development of this land could support other transport improvements in the Town, most notably a full 4-way intersection at Broughton Road with this development feasibly including provision of an access road south of the A64 between it and Broughton Road [shown as part of TM4-5 in the original version of the plan]. (3)The aim of the Neighbourhood Plan should not be to 'preserve the Towns in aspic' but rather it should be accepting of change and work with potential developers to encourage growth and prosperity for the benefit of ALL residents.</p>	<p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>(1) DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>(2)DISAGREE - it is not relevant to conflate High Malton with other areas outside the plan area - High Malton is of landscape significance in that it provides views to the AONB immediately to the west, previous proposals for 500 homes were turned down there, according to RDC's planning officers report, in order to protect the setting of the AONB which from "significant and demonstrable harm", and the "natural beauty and intrinsic character" of this attractive approach to Malton.</p> <p>(3)AGREE – the plan seeks to promote and encourage 'sustainable'</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1) NO ACTION</p> <p>(2) NO ACTION</p> <p>(3) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>I regard this as extremely important</p> <p>Green Party Policies</p> <p>The High Malton site is privately owned with no public access so it is not reasonable to categorise it as 'local green space'. The land to the north and south of Castle Howard Road is the only area within the bypass for Malton to grow. The area is flood free and within walking distance of the town centre, so is ideal for future housing. However future development in this area should require a link to York Road</p> <p>I do not agree with the Local Green Space for the area known as High Malton. I believe that the land should be available for development in the future to provide much needed housing</p> <p>I live on Castle Howard Road in Malton. (irstly, you state that you wish to protect the area concerned as "part of the setting for the Howardian Hills AONB". I think I'm correct in saying that the AONB actually starts the other side of the A64 and hence this land does not fall within it. At ground level you cannot even see the land concerned from the sign indicating the start of the AONB.</p>	<p>levels of growth and leverage infrastructure proposals from developers.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – politics have nothing to do with the justification for this policy.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation. While the AONB</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>You also claim that you wish to preserve the "high amenity value" of the area and the "high value placed on it by the local and wider community as a special open space resource". As a local resident of over 30 years I find it hard to understand exactly what "amenity" you are talking about or how the land is a "resource" to the community as it is all in private hands and has no public right of way over it! The only amenity that could possibly exist is that of the view it affords to those who live adjacent to it. I suppose the rest of us could stand and look over the hedge occasionally and marvel at the ploughed fields over which we have no right to roam!</p> <p>My views on the possible development of the site, whether as considered in the "High Malton" proposal or otherwise are neutral. Any proposals for the future use of the land should be considered on their own merits and not prevented by the adoption of a policy based on such flimsy and possibly erroneous arguments as used in your document. It seems to me that the suggested change is merely for the benefit of the few who live adjacent to the land and not the "local and wider community" on whom you partly rely to justify your argument.</p>	<p>is outside the plan area, there is no reason why it's setting cannot and indeed does fall within the plan area.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The town councils stand by the conclusion of the LGS assessment of the site, namely that it meets the majority of the eligibility criteria, crucially the landscape and community significance/value criteria, and that as such it is eligible for LGS designation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E2	<p>Supported subject to the caveat set out in our comments on E2</p> <p>see comment on no 14</p> <p>High priority</p> <p>Green Party Policies</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the reference to no 14 is not understood</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a political policy</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E3	<p>Please see comments relating to Policies E1 and 2</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>see comment on no 14</p> <p>strongly support this</p> <p>much needed</p> <p>Green Party Policies</p>	<p>NOTED – the reference to no 14 is not understood</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a political policy</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E4	<p>FME - Whilst FME support the principle of this policy, they have concerns over the extent of the proposed designation in a number of areas. The extent of this designation includes large areas of the centre of Malton which are built up including FME’s land at Sheepfoot Hill (within the area designated under draft policy RC1) and an area of land off Norton Road adjacent to the proposed E1-3 local green space designation which is occupied by a garden machinery shop. Clearly these areas are not part of a multifunctional wildlife, amenity and recreational network as suggested by the policy and therefore should be removed from the designation.</p> <p>It is also unclear why some areas of the neighbourhood plan area have been excluded from this designation when the majority of the land outside of the built-up area of Malton and Norton are included. The majority of the land identified including land under FME’s control does not contribute towards the objectives of the policy and, as such, the extent of the designation should be considered further and amended.</p> <p>Northcote Farms (NCF) – These representations have been made on behalf of North Cotes Farm Limited who farm the land edged red and green on the plan included with this letter. The land is located off Welham Road in Norton. The</p>	<p>NOTED – the reasons for the identification of the land in question as green and blue infrastructure is made clear in para 4.3.12 to 4.3.14 and Appendix 2 and is based on the interpretation of both previous mapping work by Natural England and existing Local Plan designations such as VIUA (Visually Important Undeveloped Area). It should be noted that identified areas of green and blue infrastructure, as identified by Natural England in the mapping work which refers and by local authorities generally (e.g. Leeds City Council/Strategic Green Infrastructure/Core Strategy), commonly cover built-up areas. It should also be noted that the relevant policy provision does not preclude development.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the reasons for the identification of the land in question as part of the Mill Beck Corridor as green infrastructure is made clear in</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>land is 12.07 hectares in size and is well located in respect of the existing built-up area of Norton. Directly to the north of the land are the cul-de-sacs of Hunters Way and Leat Close which contain 2-storey homes in relatively dense linear layouts. Immediately to the west are predominately 2-storey detached homes along Welham Road. To the south is a boundary with the road known as Whitewall. There is a line of homes along the southern edge of this road. The land is divided into fields which are used for grazing. The edges of the fields contain hedges and trees, inside the field boundaries there are no features except for a wood in the north east corner. We object to the classification of the land as Green Infrastructure. It is not clear why our client's land is included in the Green Infrastructure area. At present, the Site makes little contribution to the settlement viewed either from publicly accessible viewpoints within the settlement or from approach roads or paths. There are no outstanding views. The main view into the Site from Whitewall is already marred by suburban development and domestic clutter of the rear gardens of properties along Welham Road. There have been no heritage assessments produced to suggest that the Site contributes to the setting of the listed buildings Whitewall House and Whitewall Cottages which are to the south of the Site. The connection between the listed buildings and the Site is severed by Whitewall. There are no public views across the Site or from within the Site which link to the listed buildings. The horse racing industry, paddocks and stables are a common feature in the surrounding countryside and the overall landscape character would not be changed by the loss of fields on the Site. Modern development immediately east of Whitewall has affected the setting of the listed buildings. In the wider landscape, the Site is generally well contained to the north by the urban edge of Norton, to the west by existing housing along Welham Road and to the south by the rising wooded slopes of Scott's Hill. The Site does not provide a public vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside. The Site comprises 3 fields which are used for grazing and there are no distinctive landscape features that contribute to the character of the space. The rural character of Bazeley's Lane (hedgerows, woodland on Scott's Hill and individual hedgerow trees) lies further east from the Site. Views from</p>	<p>in para 4.3.12 to 4.3.14 and Appendix 2, including its existing designation as Visually Important Undeveloped Area in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy].</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Whitewall across the Site towards Malton and Norton are mostly screened by built development and vegetation, due the flat, low lying topography. Only part of the mature trees along Mill Beck can be viewed from Whitewall across the Site. Vantage points to Malton and Norton are from higher ground to the south and the Site does not contribute to these views. Our client has engaged Decimus Designs who are Landscape Architects to carry out a Landscape and Visual Assessment of our client’s Site. The have made following observations: ‘The Site has a stronger relationship with the urban edge of Norton than other areas classified as Green Infrastructure. Its character has more suburban influences than the other areas. In the wider landscape, the Site is generally well contained to the north by the urban edge of Norton, to the west by existing housing along Welham Road and to the south by the rising wooded slopes of Scott’s Hill. The Site is well screened from Welham Road, a local approach road to Norton, by existing built development. The space makes little contribution to the settlement other than being a monoculture of grazing land with a view which is already marred by suburban development and domestic clutter of the rear gardens of properties along Welham Road. There are no outstanding views or special landscape features, apart from boundary hedges and trees along Mill Beck, which would be retained whatever happens to the land. The classification of the site as Green Infrastructure is not supported by the evidence.’ This policy to include the Site as Green Infrastructure does not satisfy the basic conditions required for a Neighbourhood Plan to be made. It is an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence and therefore does not accord with National Policy. Our clients land should be removed from the Green Infrastructure policy.</p> <p>see comment on no 14</p> <p>Whilst I support the general policy/proposal I specifically object to the inclusion of The Howardian Hills being given Green and Blue Infrastructure status. Similar to policy E1 the other sites are</p>	<p>NOTED – the reference to no 14 is not understood</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policy/map only relates to Howardian Hills corridor within plan area not outside it. The whole point of the GBI designation is</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>appropriate and meet the test but with the inclusion of The Howardian Hills huge tracts of land are affected that can't be justified.</p> <p>Important community assets</p> <p>Agree strongly</p> <p>Green Party Policies</p>	<p>to safeguard the openness and connectivity of huge tracts of land</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a political policy</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E5	<p>FME - object to policy E5 as the considerations it outlines would form the basis of any assessment of a site allocation in a strategic plan or planning application. It is not the place of a Neighbourhood Plan to consider strategic matters as clearly set out in national guidance. Further development on the edge of Malton in the locality of the proposed gateways which would be in keeping and even enhance the approaches to the town.</p> <p>see comment on no 14</p> <p>Whilst I object to elements of E1 and E4 I do support this well worded policy.</p> <p>High priority</p> <p>Part of Malton and Norton's special character is the way it lies in a hollow and the countryroads lead into it, creating some beautiful views of the towns.</p> <p>Strong agreement</p> <p>Green Party Policies</p>	<p>DISAGREE – paras 4.3.16 – 4.3.18 provide the justification for this policy. The policy addresses detailed design/layout not strategic matters. The other matters raised do not preclude the inclusion of the policy within a NP</p> <p>NOTED – the reference to no 14 is not understood</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a political policy</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	I don't understand 'gateway locations'.	NOTED – the policy explains that there are 'Development at edge of settlement 'gateway locations' on the main highway routes into/out of Malton and Norton, as shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map	NO ACTION
Policy E6	<p>RDC - Revised Policy E6</p> <p><i>"Proposals for any new development within the Neighbourhood Area should contribute towards and sustain compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants within the Malton AQMA, as shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map.</i></p> <p><i>Developers promoting development which would result in an impact on air quality will be required to take into account cumulative impacts and demonstrate that the impact is acceptable and that mechanisms are in place to mitigate any adverse impacts. Such mechanisms could include the provision of green infrastructure."</i></p> <p>Visitors to our Museum which is currently located in Yorkesgate frequently suffer the adverse effects of noise and fumes from vehicles travelling queuing on the road</p> <p>see comment on no 14</p> <p>(1)Support, however I feel that (2)the reference to AQMA in T7 should be removed as this policy covers the issue sufficiently well.</p> <p>Public health issue</p> <p>Very important.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is just a restatement of the revised policy</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the reference to no 14 is not understood</p> <p>(1)NOTED (2)DISAGREE – it is assumed the reference is to TM7 not T7, this is consistent with E6 and reinforces/adds to the policy</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1) NO ACTION (2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Green Party Policies	DISAGREE – this is not a political policy	NO ACTION
Policy CF1	Valuable local resource for health and wellbeing	AGREE	NO ACTION
Policy CF2	Object due to the current wording. The policy should make reference to the provision of sufficient off road parking to service any future upgrade/ extension. Currently car parking capacity is overwhelmed during promoted sporting events leading to traffic backing up onto the B1257 causing congestion and safety concerns. Often of late parking spills over onto residential streets at the end of the school days caused by large numbers of parents waiting to pick up their children in cars (mostly SUVs). The growth of this facility must be balanced with the expected increased generation of motorised traffic.	AGREE – the policy should be amended to ensure adequate parking is provided alongside additional capacity or improved leisure facilities	ACTION – consider new policy wording to address concern.
Policy CF3	Support so long as the development of Derwent Surgery does not lead to increases in motorised traffic: Why encourage more traffic into the core of Malton and within the AQMA? Urgent - required NOW It seems obvious that if hundreds of new houses have been built, medical provision will need to be expanded. Required without delay This is long overdue.	NOTED – any development proposals would be subject to other policies in the plan and Local Plan relating to no worsening of air quality and mitigation of transport impacts NOTED – NHS N Yorks CCG advised during previous consultation that redevelopment/reconfiguration of Derwent Surgery is most viable option, but timing is dependant on NHS England/CIL funding. NOTED – NHS N Yorks CCG advised during previous consultation that redevelopment/reconfiguration of Derwent Surgery is most viable option, but timing is dependant on NHS England/CIL funding	NO ACTION NO ACTION NO ACTION

<p>Policy TC1</p>	<p>This is consistent with the Museums desire to find a new home in the town so that it can play a stronger role in attracting visitors to the town and the well being of local residents. We are in the early stages of seeking funding for a feasibility study for a new museum which will provide more space to display our nationally significant collections</p> <p>We need to look after what we already have before developing new facilities.</p> <p>HORSE RACING INDUSTRY - horse racing museum. Existing Malton Museum and Woodhams Stone need greater support. How can another museum be viable?</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is deliberately worded to be flexible enough to support whatever development options are favoured by the towns’ museums.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is deliberately worded to be flexible enough to support whatever development options are favoured by the towns’ museums.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy TC2</p>	<p>FME is wholly supportive of finding ways in which visitors can be attracted to the town but financial realities need to be considered. In the current financial climate securing funding for such projects will be challenging unless they are commercially viable.</p> <p>FME consider that draft policy TC2 should be reworded as it is not a function of the Neighbourhood Plan to ‘require’ developers to submit any specific documents as this is the remit the local authority when considering any development proposals and a matter for the validation list. As such, FME would suggest the policy wording is amended as follows “Such development will be supported providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any such development demonstrates a full understanding of any known or potential archaeological remains, and; • The application is accompanied by a heritage statement assessing the significance of remains, the impact of proposals and mitigation measures and; • Prior to commencement of work on site, agreement is reached as to appropriate actions” 	<p>DISAGREE – once made, i.e. ‘adopted’, the NP will form part of the statutory development plan for the area. As such, NPs have the same status as Local Plans and it is as much a function of a NP as of a Local Plan to require something through its policies if such requirements meet the basic conditions. Given that Orchard Fields is a scheduled ancient monument, a heritage statement is considered to be a reasonable requirement. RDC have raised no objection to and made no comment on this policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Historically important site</p> <p>Development at Orchard Fields should be very carefully limited. The walk around Lady Spring Woods has already been negatively affected by the introduction of plastic footways. Urbanisation of this area should be avoided.</p> <p>Of major historic interest</p> <p>I think this would be an enhanced facility if the development extended the full area from Orchard Fields to the Jack Berry House, creating public space, formal garden planting (MiBloom), additional parking (for Malton Events), Cafe option. The two cultivated fields in this area probably are not significantly economic when compared to the enhanced TC opportunity.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - Any proposals would be subject to the submission of a heritage statement. Historic England have no objection to and made no comment on this policy. It would of course be fully involved in any proposals.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – neither the policy nor other policies in this plan pertaining to this land in question would preclude a proposal of this nature</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy TC3</p>	<p>Support but seems to be at odds with E4 and E5</p> <p>Too many visitors are not good for local communities. Don't turn Malton into a food and holiday theme park or it and the local villages will be hollowed out by modern tourism - AirBnB, endless 'food fairs', day trippers, 'theme park' countryside. Keep the area a working town.</p> <p>Will require sensitive planning to ensure in keeping with town.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the locations have been widely drawn across areas not affected by E4 and E5, if it were in one of these locations it would need to comply but neither preclude development</p> <p>DISAGREE – results from both this and past consultations show good community support for a new hotel.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy offers in principle support only in respect of certain general locations. The acceptability of any development would be subject to detailed proposals.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

Policy TC4	<p>FME - is fully supportive of policy M1 to retain Wentworth Street Car Park for this purpose as ensuring that a significant proportion of the car park continues to provide long stay public car parking is important to the functionality of the town.</p> <p>Object to due to increased generation of traffic within the core of Malton and like as not through the AQMA</p> <p>Wentworth Street development should include Motor Home parking for overnight. See good examples from places such as Skipton.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – any proposal would need to satisfy transport and air quality requirements.</p> <p>NOTED – not a planning matter. Was discussed with RDC who reported that local bye-laws would preclude such use as things stand</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI1	<p>We acknowledge the importance of the horse racing industry as a major employer and because of its historic significance . The Museum and the Industry have a record of collaboration which we wish to continue to mutual benefit . One option could be a combined Museum</p> <p>Horse racing and farming should be key industries in Malton/Norton, as they always were. They give the towns what character it has remaining.</p> <p>I do think the longer term societal view of horse racing will diminish as more in society see it as animal exploitation and cruelty.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy TC1 is deliberately worded to be flexible enough to support whatever development options are favoured by the towns’ museums.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – that may be the case, but currently horse racing is widely recognised as a key economic driver with the local area</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI2	<p>Object. The area of the horse racing zones appears to include normal agricultural land and as such should be redrawn to the confines of the industry use.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the area/boundaries were defined widely on the basis that development adjacent to/near to spaces used by stables could generate traffic that would then use roads/tracks etc used by horses.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Development should enable diversification and transition of the Horse Racing industry to other functions in line with societal changes towards horse racing.</p> <p>WCW - Our comments are directed to the proposed horse racing zone at Whitewall. The designation of horse racing zones is presumably justified on the basis that it has some connection with the industry. The paddocks at the back of Whitewall shown on the proposals map are part of a restored mineral working and in the main, used for horse grazing. However, we understand that is as far as the connection with the horse racing industry goes. The paddocks are used for recreational horse grazing, not for the industry, and on that basis we question the designation. This is confirmed by the observation that such land is not included as a buffer to all racing stables in the plan area.</p>	<p>NOTED – this point is addressed under policy HR1 which would allow change of use should horse racing activities become unviable</p> <p>DISAGREE – the zones are based on routes identified by the steering group as those used by the industry for either exercise or moving horses to from exercise areas. The area/boundaries were defined widely on the basis that development adjacent to/near to spaces used by stables could generate traffic that would then use roads/tracks etc used by horses.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI3	See comments above	NOTED – above comments do not relate to this policies concerns re footpath/bridleway improvements.	NO ACTION
Policy HRI4	<p>Please see above re Policy HR11, viz; We acknowledge the importance of the horse racing industry as a major employer and because of its historic significance . The Museum and the Industry have a record of collaboration which we wish to continue to mutual benefit . One option could be a combined Museum</p> <p>A racing museum in Malton (which is very important) should be part of Malton museum, not separate</p> <p>Excellent idea</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert with other museum facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert or separate from with other museum facilities.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Yes to preserve the history in line with above comments as the societal view and support of horse racing declines.</p> <p>Incorporate with MM and Woodhams Stone. Funding is very hard to achieve - where will the money come from?</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert or separate from with other museum facilities. The funding challenges are acknowledged but this is not a planning matter for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HD1	<p>FME are concerned that (1) the draft policy is very prescriptive and does not allow for more alternative innovative design approaches or variety. Whilst it is acknowledged that planning policies setting out broad design principles are appropriate, the level of detail proposed in draft policy HD1 goes beyond what is considered necessary and would limit the decision makers ability to consider each site and proposal on its 'own merits'. It is therefore considered that the draft policy as currently worded is not in generally conformity with NPPF and, in particular, paragraph 127 which states:</p> <p><i>.....are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)"</i></p> <p>(2) Moreover, FME would welcome provision within the policy (or a separate policy) to support the reuse of upper floors in the town centre. Innovative design solutions may enable new uses and greater</p>	<p>(1)DISAGREE – given that the policy is couched in terms of developments 'having regard to' rather than 'being required to adhere to' it's provisions, it is considered that it is not 'very prescriptive' but rather offers sufficient flexibility for bespoke site solutions to be arrived at, guided by the stated principles. As such, it is considered that the policy 'has regard to national policy' (NB it is not required to be in general conformity with NPPF as asserted) in particular NPPF paras 127-129 with their increased emphasis on the role of NPs in local design, design guides and codes (NB the comment quotes from NPPF para 130 c) not as stated), and meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>(2) NOTED – Local Plan Strategy Policy SP7 (Town Centres and Retailing) already addresses these issues. As such, any Neighbourhood</p>	<p>(1)NO ACTION</p> <p>(2) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>vibrancy within the town centre which is a policy that would be supported by NPPF.</p> <p>I feel strongly that the architecture, street planning and trees etc of the conservation areas should be protected.</p>	<p>Plan policy would be duplication. Given also that SP7 is a strategic policy, the NP must be in general conformity so it could not include a policy which conflicts with or seeks to go beyond its provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – this is what the policy aims to achieve</p>	NO ACTION
Policy HD2	<p>WCW - HD2: Development and Design – Area-wide Principles</p> <p>We consider that this policy duplicates the content of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy, particularly policy SP16. The policy should be edited to remove those parts which are redundant, should concentrate on purely matters of local importance and should mention that further advice is available in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>DISAGREE - it is considered that policy adds detail to SP16 rather than duplicates. RDC have raised no objection throughout, nor commented on any duplication.</p>	NO ACTION
Policy HD3	<p>The focus should be on local residents, though, not on visitors. The character of Malton and Norton should be preserved to improve the lives of those who live here, not to draw in day trippers.</p>	<p>NOTED – the text explains one of the purposes of the policy is to be welcoming and attractive to <u>both</u> the community and visitors and is consistent with other policies which recognise the importance of the visitor economy</p>	NO ACTION
Policy HD4	<p>Strongly support</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	NO ACTION
Policy HD8	<p>The proposed path along the east side of the village and extension of the path northwards to the Doodales, allowing a return path to the village along Lascelles Lane as shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map (second pre-submission version) passes directly behind our home. We feel it is inappropriate to locate a public footpath in this area for the following reasons. The route proposed would have an impact on our privacy and security. It would also impact the quiet natural environment of The Doodales and would disturb the nesting birds etc. The Council must be satisfied that it is expedient that a way</p>	<p>NOTED – this proposal came through the conservation area appraisal for Old Malton. A number of objections have been raised and it is proposed to remove the proposal for a path.</p>	<p>ACTION – remove last bullet point from policy HD8</p>

	<p>should be created, having regard to the extent to which it would add to the convenience or enjoyment of a substantial section of the public, or to the convenience of persons resident in the area, and the effect that creation would have on rights of persons interested in the land. We do not believe these criteria can be met with the proposed route in accordance with S.26 of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>The proposed path along the east side of the village and extension of the path northwards to the Doodales, allowing a return path to the village along Lascelles Lane as shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map (second pre-submission version) passes through our fields that are used for grazing cattle, and across our track that is regularly used for movements of Tractors and Farm Animals. We feel it is inappropriate to locate a public footpath in this area for the following reasons. It creates a health and safety hazard for anyone crossing a field full of cattle and their calves. Dog walkers would be at particular risk of serious incident particularly when the cows have calves. Dogs can host Neospora which is excreted in their faeces and can cause cows to abort their calves. The public footpath would have a significant impact on our farming activities as we would not be able to put cattle in a field with a public right of way as there have been many instances of injuries to public and these would not be manageable. The fields are not suitable for other farming activities and so would become unproductive. The proposed route would have a significant detrimental impact to the privacy of the residents to the east of Lascelles Lane. The Council must be satisfied that it is expedient that a way should be created, having regard to the extent to which it would add to the convenience or enjoyment of a substantial section of the public, or to the convenience of persons resident in the area, and the effect that creation would have on rights of persons interested in the land. We do not believe these criteria can be met with the proposed route in accordance with S.26 of the Highways Act 1980.</p>	<p>NOTED – this proposal came through the conservation area appraisal for Old Malton. A number of objections have been raised and it is proposed to remove the proposal for a path</p>	<p>ACTION – remove last bullet point from policy HD8</p>
<p>Policy HD11</p>	<p>FME - As outlined in relation to draft policy TC2, it is considered a matter for the Local Planning Authority to determine the level of information that would need to support any planning application.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – once made, i.e. ‘adopted’, the NP will form part of the statutory development plan for</p>	<p>ACTION – minor rewording, largely to reflect new administrative reality</p>

	<p>Moreover, the suggested requirements for the policy are overly onerous as there may be circumstances where archaeology is of low significance/value and therefore does not need to be excavated or fully recorded. There are also instances where following a geophysical survey the significance of any likely archaeology is low and any field excavation can be controlled by condition and undertaken after the development has been approved.</p> <p>As such, FME would question the need for draft policy HD11 as these matters are already dealt with as part any planning application.</p> <p>WCW - This policy also duplicates large parts of national policy (NPPF paras 194-208) and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy (policy SP12) and the policy should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy supported subject to the provision of interpretation panels where appropriate . All such sites lie within the Museum collections area and there are opportunities to preserve and display the results of the excavations in the Museum</p>	<p>the area. As such, NPs have the same status as Local Plans and it is as much a function of a NP as of a Local Plan to require something through its policies if such requirements meet the basic conditions. Given the extent and importance of archaeological remains in the area (ref NP Appendix 3), the policy is not overly onerous as asserted. The policy does not, as stated in the comment require excavation or full recording of sites where archaeology is of low significance/value but rather a desk top survey and then only a field evaluation if warranted. Neither does the policy require any field excavation before approval as asserted, but rather agreement as to what that field evaluation should entail before approval.</p> <p>DISAGREE - policy builds on and adds to NPPF para 194. Disagree that it duplicates large swathes of NPPF as asserted. Disagree that it duplicates SP12. RDC have raised no objection/made no comment re duplication)</p> <p>AGREE – where appropriate, provision of interpretation panels should be made</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re investigating which LGS/historic sites warrant interpretation panels, in cooperation with Malton Museum’s existing initiative</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>We think the policy should be strengthened to include reference to the potential to provide further interpretation panels relating to the history of the area and supplementing those already erected at Orchard Fields and those soon to be provided by the Museum at Brooklyn House School</p>	<p>AGREE – where appropriate, provision of interpretation panels should be made</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community action re investigating which LGS/historic sites warrant interpretation panels, in cooperation with Malton Museum’s existing initiative.</p>
<p>Policy H1</p>	<p>FME - concerned by the limited evidence base which seems to support draft policy H1 and the lack of any professional assessment of housing needs. Indeed, it is considered that such matters should be dealt with by the Ryedale Local Plan (strategic plan) which will be informed by an appropriate evidence base including an up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment reference is from 2010 and is therefore over 10 years old. It is unlikely to be reflective of current housing needs and moreover developments need to provide a mix if housing is to meet all needs.</p> <p>Given the priority to maintain wildlife and nature habitat, it is unfortunate that further loss to new housing development is planned. Notably, that envisaged for the Beverly Road. There are, I am aware, both government and regional imposed quotas and we must accordingly take our share of the burden. Please therefore reject as far as possible all policy that seeks to build more peripheral housing on green land. Not only does this blight the landscape but also creates</p>	<p>DISAGREE – it is acknowledged that the evidence base does not include a professionally conducted local housing needs assessment. However, it fully reflects a community consultation involving over 300 local people, the findings of which reflect those of RDC’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NB as pointed out by RDC in its comments – supporting text is to be amended to make this point). RDC have not objected to the policy. Further, experience shows that NP examiners find such policies in line with basic conditions, particularly as they are couched in terms of support for a particular mix rather than requiring that mix.</p> <p>NOTED – the allocation of additional sites for housing will be undertaken by NYC as part of its site allocation process. It was decided that the neighbourhood plan would not allocate land for housing due to a lot of local concern regarding the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>congestion, pollution, noise. Unwelcome social issues may also follow from those moving in who work far afield.</p> <p>But guard against overdevelopment</p> <p>But guard against overdevelopment in general.</p> <p>Need to increase single person accommodation, in particular for young people. Predominantly 2 bed accommodation available only and thus single people are affected by single room rate for benefits. Needs within private rented sector and social housing, less so in owner-occupation. Source data perhaps affected by lack of engagement in the planning process from young people. If housing is not available, there will be a significant outward migration of young people from the area to York and Scarborough</p>	<p>housing requirement and the impact of building new homes in Malton and Norton. In particular, the potential impact on the road network and the river crossings</p> <p>AGREE – this one of the reasons it had been decided not to allocate land for housing in particular due to a lot of local concern regarding the housing requirement and the impact of building new homes in Malton and Norton. In particular, the potential impact on the road network and the river crossings</p> <p>AGREE – this one of the reasons it had been decided not to allocate land for housing in particular due to a lot of local concern regarding the housing requirement and the impact of building new homes in Malton and Norton. In particular, the potential impact on the road network and the river crossings</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is not prescriptive – it is couched in terms of supporting a specified mix rather than requiring it and then only on small sites. The mix specified fully reflects the findings from a community survey of over 300 local households as stated in supporting text.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Provided the infrastructure and amenities are in place.</p> <p>HOUSING. The towns' infrastructure and health/education provision must come first.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be in place before any new houses are built. Empty properties should be developed first.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this is not relevant to a policy which is not proposing any new housing or allocating any new housing sites.</p> <p>AGREE – this one of the reasons it had been decided not to allocate land for housing in particular due to a lot of local concern regarding the housing requirement and the impact of building new homes in Malton and Norton. In particular, the potential impact on the road network and the river crossings</p> <p>AGREE – this one of the reasons it had been decided not to allocate land for housing in particular due to a lot of local concern regarding the housing requirement and the impact of building new homes in Malton and Norton. In particular, the potential impact on the road network and the river crossings</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy EM1	<p>Subject the addition of the words "culture and heritage"</p> <p>Please reduce the stress on food industries. They are smelly (my house smells every morning from one of the food factories). They create low</p>	<p>DISAGREE – culture and heritage are not recognised employment sectors in themselves. Their importance is well recognised throughout the plan but it is not considered appropriate to reference in the employment policy</p> <p>DISAGREE –the local food industry embraces a diverse community of businesses and jobs. It is a key sector</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>wage and insecure jobs. They take money out of the area in excess profits. They should be discouraged</p> <p>I feel this should be edited: Development proposals for employment generating uses, particularly in the key local employment sectors of food, tourism, horse racing, retail and green industries, are encouraged and will be supported. To: Development proposals for employment generating uses, particularly in the key local employment sectors of food, tourism, retail and green industries, horse related, are encouraged and will be supported. So as to change implied priority and emphasis.</p>	<p>for growth in the local economy (see text 4.9.10). Food production is one part of the sector, the complaints highlighted re smells are really outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan and are more issues for environmental health</p> <p>DISAGREE – the listing of the employment relating uses does not imply any prioritisation, no need to change</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy M1</p>	<p>FME - is fully supportive of policy M1 to retain Wentworth Street Car Park for this purpose as ensuring that a significant proportion of the car park continues to provide long stay public car parking is important to the functionality of the town.</p> <p>Wentworth Street car park must remain a car park</p> <p>Object. Rarely is this car park anywhere close to capacity so some loss of parking can be tolerated so long as the development is beneficial to the community.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it was clearly apparent from consultation that retention of the site in car parking use (with some improvements) was the most preferred use. NP Policy TC4 if implemented will result in some loss of car parking capacity. Trees/ planting would be covered under the environmental improvement umbrella.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Include Motor Home parking.</p> <p>Wentworth Street Car Park is under used and is a magnet for anti social behaviour. It's preservation in its current form is misguided</p>	<p>NOTED – parking by motor homes is not precluded by the policy. That said, this is not really a planning matter. Was discussed with RDC who reported that local bye-laws would preclude such use as things stand</p> <p>NOTED – it was clearly apparent from consultation that retention of the site in car parking use (with some improvements) was the most preferred use. NP Policy TC4 if implemented will result in some loss of car parking capacity. Trees/ planting would be covered under the environmental improvement umbrella.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy M2	<p>FME - is supportive of draft policy M2 albeit that there should be some flexibility over the location of any compensatory parking as opportunities arise to deliver improvements in the town centre.</p> <p>Should include a greater permanent seating area immediately outside the Church with only the loss of about 4 spaces and improve safety of pedestrian access to the top side by stopping vehicle access at that point.</p> <p>It would be ideal to have a Market Place for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Car parking spaces in Malton Market Place are to the detriment of pedestrians and 'cafe culture' eg immediately outside the New Malton / Chapter Two. We need a market place for people, not cars.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy wording allows for the suggested flexibility.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording does not preclude this suggestion</p> <p>DISAGREE – this point was raised during consultation and it was clearly apparent that keeping the car park as it is was the most preferred use.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this point was raised during consultation and it was clearly apparent that keeping the car</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

		park as it is was the most preferred use.	
Policy N1	<p>Object. Better to invest in existing retail facilities along Commercial Street rather than creating new retail units with parking that will generate more traffic to the core of Norton. Better to commercial or light industrial NOT retail.</p> <p>Norton is in need of regeneration.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this is a challenging site and some flexibility on uses will be needed to enable its re-development. The type of retail user is unlikely to compete with those on Commercial Street and complementary uses could improve the viability of the centre</p> <p>AGREE – the policy aims to support regeneration</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Community Actions	<p>FME - On page 56, FME suggest that the list of matters to be addressed would benefit from the addition of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach parking (1) • Improved standard of welfare facilities (2) • Improved directional signage (3) <p>In addition, FME suggest that there should be reference within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan to supporting the viability of the Milton Rooms and protecting it as a resource for the town.</p> <p>WCW - We consider that the NP should mention the two quarries in the Plan area that could potentially supply building stone. Brow's Quarry on York Road is a Mineral & Waste Local Plan allocated site but is not operational and has not been used for many years. It is doubtful if it could be operated purely to supply the odd local repair contract for historic buildings in Malton and Norton. The second quarry is at Whitewall which has for several years supplied quantities of stone to</p>	<p>(1) And (2) NOTED – this had been discussed with RDC and deemed not feasible (3) In principle this is accepted but needs to be explored in more detail to examine the specifics, eg what/where with the relevant authorities/agencies</p> <p>AGREE – this referred to under 5.21, it includes an action to 'Secure the future viable use of the Milton Rooms.'</p> <p>NOTED – this can be referred to in the supporting text</p>	<p>(1) (2) NO ACTION</p> <p>(3) ACTION - add to Action Plan</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include reference in para 5.18</p>

	<p>the building stone market through suppliers such as Dring's of Pickering. It is only able to do this because it also supplies stone for local construction and agricultural purposes (which bears the bulk of the costs of quarrying). This too should be mentioned as an important contributor to maintenance of the local heritage fabric.</p> <p>Yes, generally but add reference to the historic trail in addition to an arts trail. Both can be linked to the principle points of arrival (eg railways station) and town centres and encourage visitor and residents to visit the whole of this historically significant area .</p> <p>Nothing further than my previous comments</p> <p>(1) Page numbers referred to are wrong (2) I don't see how removal of traffic bumps and chicanes will help to slow down all types of motor vehicles - some form of horizontal traffic calming is preferred to vertical measures like cushions, tables etc(3) Shuttle bus to and from Eden camp can't be financially feasible(4) Pedestrian finger signs are pointless in such a small town. Malton should promote its market place zone as many people driving through the Town wouldn't know it is there.</p> <p>The initial submission to RDC was adequate.</p> <p>A grade separated junction at Broughton Road and the A64 will never be achievable. New link roads to the west of the town should be achieved through development permissions</p>	<p>AGREE – this suggestion has appeared a number of time suggest adding a comprehensive visitors trail to signpost and inform visitors of the town's heritage and cultural offer</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>(1)NOTED – it is not clear which page numbers are wrong. (2)NOTED – this is a fair point. A more considered approach is required (3) NOTED - maybe the case at moment but if the idea is a good one and the NP long term (4)NOTED – no evidence has been submitted on financial viability of the services</p> <p>NOTED – there are minor changes which are necessary to reflect the updated policies from the 1st submission</p> <p>NOTED – this is a point of view as is the contention that new link roads could be achieved through development. There is evidence through the Jacobs Transport</p>	<p>ACTION - add to 5.21 a comprehensive visitors trail to signpost and inform visitors of the town's heritage and cultural offer</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>(1) NO ACTION (2) ACTION – amend community action to 'consulting/liaising with local residents on most effective ways to slow down traffic in the specified localities' (3) NO ACTION (4) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>There is good evidence that pedestrianised town centres attract footfall simply because they are safer and much more pleasant. Malton seems to have a huge problem with this! Cycle racks in the Market Place were removed and never replaced. Even on market days, pedestrians have to compete with vehicles.</p>	<p>Assessment to test the A64/Broughton Road junction, but no testing has been done of link roads to the west of Malton. Experience from elsewhere is that development on a very large scale would be needed to fund the cost.</p> <p>(1)NOTED – this issue was raised through consultation and feedback was that the availability of short stay car parking was important for businesses and their customers – this would not however preclude some form of pedestrianisation or changes in priorities to favour non car users. (2)policies now encourage/support more cycle parking in Market Place</p>	<p>(1)and(2) - NO ACTION</p>
Habitat Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environment Assessment	<p>RDC - Officers have reviewed the technical reports of the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and the Habitats Regulations assessment (HRA). In relation to the HRA Officers agree with the conclusions that the revisions do not result in changes to the screening assessment, and according the appropriate assessment. Concerning the SEA, Officers note the updated baseline information, which demonstrates a robust approach to the consideration of the evidence base. Officers also note that the policies which have been updated were previously screened out of the SEA/HRA and officers would agree that the proposed changes have not resulted in these revised policies being now capable of being screened into the SEA/HRA assessment.</p> <p>Historic England (HE) - Thank you for consulting Historic England on the second Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report for the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan. We note that our responses and advice contained in our letter of 24th August 2020 have been acted upon, and we do not therefore wish to make further</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>comments. We trust the above advice is clear and look forward to receiving the consultations on the Submission draft of the Malton Neighbourhood Plan, in due course.</p> <p>Natural England (NE) is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England has considered the above consultation and has no comments to make regarding the updates to the SEA and HRA documents for the Regulation 14 consultation. As no changes have been made to these documents that could impact the advice in our letter dated 20 June 2022 for the Regulation 16 consultation, we have no further comments to make at this stage.</p>	NOTED	NO ACTION
General – pedestrian crossings and routes	<p>(1) I think the following locations would be good for pedestrian crossings: 1) Yorkersgate between Market St and Saville Street - difficult and dangerous road to cross 2) Horsemarket Rd by war memorial - cars go v. fast up this road and it is a route towards train station from west of town 3) Old Maltongate between E. Mount and Greengate - a route people take to get to train station and Norton from Peasey Hills area 4) middle of Castle gate bridge.</p> <p>(2) Would be good to have some bike racks in the centre of town like there used to be. The current ones are not suitable because - 1) if you put your bike there it may be knocked over by a car 2) if you put your bike there you can't lock your frame to it. They are best in places where they are in the open and on clear view. Cycle tourists like to be able to see their bikes from a cafe to ensure they aren't being stolen.</p> <p>Removal of a pedestrian, cycleway and bridleway improvement route from Middlecave Road-Malton Community Sports Centre (via Malton School Grounds) (Policy TM1). I don't agree with this change. It was stated that the school had Safeguarding concerns. I think the idea was</p>	<p>(1)NOTED – safer crossings have featured consistently in feedback. The precise locations and form of crossing will need to be agreed with NYC, but it is proposed to address the issue in the NP</p> <p>(2) AGREE – policy (TM1) would benefit from strengthening in this respect</p> <p>NOTED – this proposal had been removed due to objections raised by Malton School. If there is a feasible route to accommodate this</p>	<p>(1) ACTION - Add new community actions in respect of the 4 crossing locations highlighted</p> <p>(2)ACTION – consider strengthening policy TM1 re secure cycle parking</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re investigating feasibility with all parties</p>

	miss interpreted in terms of the design and location, which are critical to meeting the opportunity and needs of the school. If it were located at the far end of the east perimeter of the school next to the property boundaries on Middlecave through to Broughton Road it could be achieved with minimal impact to just a small area of staff parking to the rear of the east block and some waste storage bin locations. If the fencing design was sufficiently high and of solid design, any safeguarding concerns should be minimised. The land required should only be about 3 to 4 metres wide.	aspiration which addresses the school concerns then this could be resurrected, but as the feasibility has not been addressed it is not considered it can be included as a policy at this stage.	
General – Layout/Presentation	<p>(1)This form is very difficult to use in conjunction with the complex information on the website. Therefore, I am not sure I have commented on the Green Space designation for High Malton in the correct box. (2)To reiterate, I do not think that High Malton should be designated as a Green Space in the M&N Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Updates to the Plan should be readily available online and promoted to ensure residents are aware of changes. By way of an observation, I have found the information on the Malton TC website very confusing and had difficulty actually finding the relevant documents to respond to this consultation: The RDC pages were easier to negotiate.</p>	<p>(1)NOTED – it is acknowledged the digital consultation process can be unwieldy, however the form is very widely used for these purposes, hard copies have been made available and Members/staff at the council have offered support</p> <p>(2)DISAGREE – the arguments in favour of High Malton being designated a LGS are set out in the notes and actions under Policy E1</p> <p>NOTED – updates will be made available on line</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
General – New Town & Strategic Road Improvements	Please please make the Braygate to A64 slip road happen as articulated lorries passing our house are dangerous, polluting, noisy, and unnecessary.	NOTED – the plan indicates support for this proposal and provides a policy context for it. Delivery will need to be pursued with the transport authorities – NYC and Highways England	NO ACTION

<p>General</p>	<p>FME - very much welcome being involved in the development of the Plan and would be happy to assist the Neighbourhood Plan group wherever possible. If it is considered beneficial, we would be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss these representations and how FME may assist going forward at a time of the group's convenience.</p> <p>However, FME strongly object to the designation of land at High Malton as Local Green Space for the reasons clearly outlined in these representations. The proposed designation clearly does not meet the requirements in NPPF at paragraph 102 of NPPF and therefore doesn't not meet the basic conditions of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could ensure that FME and ELG Planning are informed for any further consultations or opportunities to comment as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses.</p> <p>Support Malton/Norton's traditional industries and quality, small local businesses. We have some fantastic local businesses. There is too much stress on food factories and food festivals. The towns are being over-expanded with housing and new people too quickly. This is destroying any sense of community that incomers are searching for and residents value. Malton/Norton are in danger of becoming urban jungles rather than lovely market towns that area joy to live in.</p> <p>We should preserve and improve what is here already rather than always striving for growth.</p> <p>Changes made to suit the interests of certain Councillors and the where they live.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to be radical and really improve our towns. Let's not mess it up!</p>	<p>NOTED – the response to comments on High Malton are addressed under Policy E1 above.</p> <p>NOTED – these comments summarise individual comments on specific policies and have been responded to individually against the relevant policy</p> <p>DISAGREE – the plan is being made for the whole community and was approved for Reg 14 consultation purposes by both Malton and Norton Town Councils</p> <p>NOTED – although there is no specific comment to respond to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
----------------	---	--	---